

Appl. No. 09/921,285
Amdt. dated December 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 15, and 16 have been amended. Claims 18 and 19 have been added. No claims have been canceled.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the Interview conducted on November 29, 2005. During the Interview, the differences between the cited reference and the detection of an address according to embodiments of the present invention were discussed.

35 USC §102 Rejection, Philips et al.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,542,266 to Philips et al. (Philips).

Claims 1-13 and 18-19

Claim 1 is allowable as Philips does not disclose or suggest every element of claim 1, as amended. For example, claim 1 recites a method comprising "*detecting an address associated with the coupled user device, the address not being stored in the service record.*"

Philips describes a method of assigning different well-known virtual paths to a customer device based on a provisioned customer physical port profile and a VPI/VCI table. See *Phillips*, col. 5, lines, 42-46. In order to assign the proper virtual path, the user sends a log-on message, which includes a MAC address of the customer device. See *Phillips*, col. 8, lines, 3-6. After receiving the log-on message, the HDT matches the MAC address to one stored in the customer port profile. See *Phillips*, col. 8, lines, 31-44. On the contrary, claim 1 recites "the address not being stored in the service record."

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. As claim 1 is allowable, dependent claims 2-13 and 18-19 are allowable for at least the same rationale.

Claim 14

Applicants submit that claim 14 should be allowable for at least the same rationale as discussed with respect to claim 1.

Appl. No. 09/921,285
Amdt. dated December 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

PATENT

Claim 15

Applicants submit that claim 15 should be allowable for at least the same rationale as discussed with respect to claim 1. As claim 15 is allowable, dependent claims 16-17 are allowable for at least the same rationale.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: December 1, 2005

David B. Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
BNY:dk
60595051 v1